

SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

24th Year of Publication

The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

Volume XXIV, No. 8

P.O. Box 6226A, Washington, D.C. 20015

© May 1, 1994

New Technology Programs Underline Policy Shift

Responding to complaints of neglect, the Clinton Administration has increased its volume of comforting talk to the scientific community, and is working on a science-policy paper to complement its declarations on technology policy. But the flow of "new" money—the most precious currency in budget-strapped Washington—continues in the direction of industrial technology, with announcements last week of plans for additional, well-financed R&D collaborations with industry.

Meanwhile, federal support for academic science remains essentially level in real terms in the President's budget for the coming fiscal year. If all comes out as planned, that's not too bad, given the potential for fiscal carnage on Capitol Hill. But in recent years, as the Congressional appropriations process has moved into the spring-summer homestretch, basic-research budgets have been raided to provide money for more politically potent programs. The reality of science programs is that they exist on goodwill and a dim recognition of their

million for next year—an 80 percent increase.

Within those grand totals, the biggest gainer is NIST's Advanced Technology Program (ATP), which serves as a marriage broker and cost-sharer for industrial consortia focused on scientific and technical barriers to marketplace riches. Warmly favored by Clinton's policy planners as a device for enlivening industrial technology, ATP is budgeted this year for \$200 million and for \$451 million next year—a 126 percent increase. When Clinton took office, ATP's budget was merely \$67 million.

On April 25, NIST announced an expansion into five areas, "the first subjects for focused technology programs under the ATP," with planned federal funding of \$745 million over five years, plus—as is required in ATP programs—matching contributions by industrial collaborators.

(Continued on Page 2)

Q&A From Rep. Dingell's Hearing On Fraud in Breast Cancer Trials—P. 3

economic importance and cultural value, rather than the political muscle that works for other sectors of the federal budget.

The sorry tale of finance for the National Science Foundation is one of last-minute Congressional diversions of its hoped-for funds to round out the budgets for federal housing programs and veterans care. Traditional supporters of the Space Station now concede that it must be abandoned to prevent starvation throughout the rest of NASA. And even the National Institutes of Health, revered in Congress for its medicine if not its management, has been nicked by the House Budget Resolution, which would allow a \$278 million increase next year, \$240 million less than requested by Clinton.

On the industrial front, the big news is the broadening of the programs of the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) and a far-reaching, big-money expansion of Department of Defense and Department of Energy assistance for developing flat-panel computer display screens, high on the list of hot technologies for civilian and military markets.

If Congress accepts Clinton's budget proposals for NIST, which it appears eager to do, the booming successor to the staid National Bureau of Standards will be far out front as the fastest-growing agency in the federal government. With a budget this year of \$520 million, NIST is going for \$935

In Brief

Scrambling to salvage its credibility after the roasting it took last month for sloppy surveillance of breast cancer studies [SGR April 15], the National Cancer Institute has announced the suspension of Louisiana State University and Tulane University from signing on new patients. NCI says it took the action on March 18, but public disclosure wasn't made until April 21, a week after NIH Director Harold Varmus and NCI Director Samuel Broder were grilled by Rep. John Dingell. NCI officials have also announced that management of the multi-center National Surgical Adjuvant Breast and Bowel Project may be put up for competitive bids next year. The University of Pittsburgh has had a lock on the \$17 million contract for many years.

Education Pays Off: 74 of the top 100 "Molecular Millionaires" hold doctoral degrees, according to the latest annual compilation of big bucks in biotech by Genetic Engineering News (April 10). The total value of their 1994 stock holdings was placed at \$1.24 billion, a one-year increase of \$200 million. The survey did not deal with real money.

Intramural research at NIH "is losing some of its edge," according to an analysis by the Research Department of the Institute for Scientific Information, reported in ISI's *ScienceWatch* dated March. On the basis of citation counts, an analytical technique developed by ISI, the report concludes, "Research papers by NIH scientists published over the last five years are failing to carry quite the same clout as those published during the early-to-mid-1980s."

... Advanced Tech Program Moves into New Fields

(Continued from Page 1)

The subject areas, the announcement said, were derived from 550 "white papers" prepared by industrial organizations, and were described as follows:

- "Tool for DNA Diagnostics—a five-year, \$145 million program to develop compact, low-cost, automated DNA analysis technologies and equipment to enable fast, inexpensive detection and diagnosis of human, animal and plant diseases.

- "Information Infrastructure for Healthcare—a five-year, \$185 million program to develop critical information infrastructure technologies to enable enhanced, more fully integrated medical information systems across the healthcare industry, greatly reducing costs and errors in handling medical information.

- "Manufacturing Composite Structure—a five-year, \$160 million program to reduce the high initial costs of using advanced composite materials, traditionally found only in military and sports applications, to enable use of these strong, lightweight, durable materials in large-scale commercial applications such as bridges and automobiles.

- "Component-Based Software—a five-year, \$150 million program to develop the technologies necessary to enable systematically reusable software components—small, carefully engineered software elements suitable for automated assembly in a broad array of applications.

- "Computer-Integrated Manufacturing for Electronics—a five-year, \$105 million program to develop a flexible, software-based framework needed to promote a greater manufacturability, productivity and product variety in the electronics industry—allowing US firms to more easily scale up and reconfigure their manufacturing operations."

The DOD-DOE flat-panel program would expand the present low level of federal assistance in this area, with \$450 million in research funds over five years, plus funds for constructing manufacturing facilities.

While the recipients of Washington's high-tech largess and the staffers who dish it out are understandably jubilant about the Clinton Administration's enthusiasm for assisting industrial research, some wonderment is in order about why it is at all necessary.

According to the latest annual *R&D Forecast* from Battelle, which tracks these things closely, American industry will spend \$84.9 billion of its own money on R&D this year—a figure that dwarfs the funds that Washington is providing for trendy work in industrial high-tech. Even more puzzling is that ATP has provided money for consortia that include some of industry's biggest R&D spenders, among them IBM, AT&T, Bell Labs, and Du Pont.

Discussing this with SGR in an interview published December 1, 1992, George Uriano, the founding chief of the Advanced Technology Program, explained the involvement of industry's big R&D spenders as follows:

"Because there are ideas at companies like IBM that are

so risky that IBM itself will simply not support them, or support them on a timely basis. If the IBM researchers bring in other companies, too, they're willing to pay some of the costs, but not all of the costs. And not on a timely basis. In fact, I know people at companies like IBM that have actually turned down projects that we have later funded. I know the people that turned them down, because it didn't get to the bottom line quickly enough. On the other hand," the ATP chief said, "only time will say whether it will ever get to the bottom line, because we are funding high-risk projects."

NIST's supporters back up the program with enthusiastic testimony to Congress. Appearing before NIST's House Appropriations Subcommittee on April 26, Nathan Hurt, Chairman of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers Task Force on NIST, praised the Advanced Technology Program as "the centerpiece and role model for US efforts to enhance industrial/federal partnerships."

Hurt, who is manager of business development for Los Alamos Technical Associates, in Denver, expressed only one reservation about ATP—that its cost-sharing requirement of 50 percent by industry might inhibit participation by small and medium-size firms.

The Administration's strong thrusts into industrial technology closely follow policy plans Clinton set out in a campaign paper and in two similar papers issued after he took office, of which the most recent is *Technology for Economic Growth: President's Progress Report*, published last November. In this sector, even Clinton's severest critics would have to acknowledge that he's doing what he said he would do. As spelled out in the *Progress Report*, the aim is to "provide incentives to industry to undertake high-priority technology-development activities that have not attracted private-sector investment...."

After many complaints about the Administration's seeming neglect of academic research and basic science, the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy responded in January by sponsoring a "Forum on Science in the National Interest" [SGR, February 15], at which some 200 invitees presented ideas that are supposed to be considered for a companion paper on science policy, in preparation.—DSG

© 1994, Science & Government Report, Inc.

Editor and Publisher
Daniel S. Greenberg

Associate Publisher
Wanda J. Reif

Circulation Manager
Glen D. Grant

Published by Science & Government Report, Inc., twice monthly, except once each in January, July, August, and September. Annual subscriptions: Institutions, \$425.00 (two years, \$730.00). Bulk and individual rates upon request. Editorial offices at 3736 Kanawha St. NW, Washington, DC 20015. Tel. (202) 244-4135. For subscription service: PO Box 6226A, Washington, DC 20015. Tel. 1-800-522-1970; in Washington, DC 785-5054. Reproduction without permission is prohibited. SGR is available on University Microfilms International. Claims for missing back issues will be filled without charge if made within six weeks of publication date. ISSN 0048-9581.

On Dingell's Grill: Q&A From Cancer-Fraud Hearing

April 13 was a woeful day on Capitol Hill for the National Institutes of Health as NIH Director Harold Varmus and Samuel Broder, Director of the National Cancer Institute, faced Chairman John Dingell and colleagues at a hearing on fraud and concealment of risk data in clinical cancer trials administered by the University of Pittsburgh, the National Surgical Adjuvant Breast and Bowel Project (NSABP). SGR's initial account of the proceedings [April 15] was constrained by a close deadline and limited space. However, the colloquies between the Congressmen and the research leaders ought not to be lost in Washington's monsoon of words, and so major chunks are presented here, condensed but essentially as spoken before Chairman Dingell's Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations.

Have the Patients Been Told? Maybe

Dingell. Have all of the women who were put at risk by the failure to adequately disclose the [tamoxifen] risk levels with regard to uterine cancer or other perils been informed of the new level of risk or the level of risk as we now know it? They either had been advised or they had not been advised. We can get, I think, a fairly simple yes or no answer.

Broder. In that case, the answer is no. The process in large, far-flung community-based studies requires several steps. We could theoretically provide notice of some type. A local institutional review board, not responding to the government, must approve and endorse any changes in informed consent. We do try to make the information as publicly available as we can, but I cannot assure you that every single woman has signed a new consent form.

Dingell. I'm trying to understand. We have many questions here, one of which is the simple moral question: Shouldn't these women be informed of the fact that they have been put at additional risk which was not disclosed to them at the time they agreed to participate in the study?

Broder. Yes. And that process is going on now and will be completed. If your question is will every single woman be notified, the answer is yes.

Dingell. When will that occur?

Varmus. Mr. Chairman, all of the 306 sites of the tamoxifen prevention study have been informed of the recommendations to change the consent forms to be in accord with the newly available evidence. Now, of course, it is the responsibility of those who are in charge of the study at each of those sites to respond and to inform each of the patients. The NCI itself, of course, can't inform the patients directly.

Dingell. Have you told me that all of the women have been informed or just that the sites have been informed?

Varmus. All of the sites have been informed and we hope, we trust, and we will enforce—

Dingell. How are we to say that the sites have informed the women? We cannot say so, can we?

Broder. Mr. Dingell, you are quite right to raise this

issue. The trial is currently suspended. We have taken our process of how one informs women of new and evolving side effects to the [NIH] Office of Protection from Research Risks, which advises us on that process. The Office advised us that upon their evaluation, this process did not require an immediate call-back notification, but could be done in the normal cycle in which women would come back to the clinic. We, however, have chosen not to take that option, and we will be calling women back.

Dingell. I hear a goodly number of things, but we have clearly established that we cannot say that the women have been notified.

Broder. I cannot tell you that every single woman has been notified.

Dingell. But here you have the good Dr. [Bernard] Fisher [Director of the NCI-sponsored research], the University of Pittsburgh, all the grant recipients, and you have imposed no requirement on them to report to the participants in the study of new information relative to risk, nor of increased risk which has come to your attention.

Bruce Chabner, Director, NCI Cancer Treatment Division. Congressman, the University of Pittsburgh, Dr. Fisher, holds the IND [Investigational New Drug authority] in this trial. They have a legal obligation to notify participants in their trial. That is their obligation.

Dingell. Have they done that?

Chabner. They've been instructed to do it. Whether they've done it or not—

Dingell. They seem to be somewhat deficient in following up on instructions, according to what we've heard today. It is probably too much to say they've been snapping their finger under your nose, but certainly their behavior has been less than the requirements that you would impose on them in terms of good moral behavior or in terms of seeing that the experiment is conducted in a sound scientific fashion.

Broder. They don't respond to constructive criticism.

Dingell. Well, we're going to help. We think that now maybe we ought to have the University of Pittsburgh before us to discuss these things.

Hesitant to Confront Fisher

Rep. Dan Schaefer (R-Colo.). We're dealing with a lot of women's lives [in breast-cancer trials].

Michael A. Friedman, Associate Director, NCI Cancer Therapy Evaluation Program. The subject is enormously important. The quality of the data, the trust with which the public holds these data are terribly important. Our ability to compel Dr. Fisher, our ability to institute changes which we recommended did not occur until recently.

Schaefer. So you had recommended these changes [earlier]?

Friedman. Yes, sir, we had.

Schaefer. And it was stonewalled. In other words, nothing.
(Continued on Page 4)

... The Chairman Applies "Aunt Minnie Sniff Test"

(Continued from Page 3)
ing was done.

Broder. I believe the correct answer is that Dr. Fisher, maybe not directly, but in effect, told us by implication that he's been doing clinical trials a long time, perhaps before we were out of school. He knows what to do. He's been doing things since the late 1950s, and he knows how to get the job done. No one will ever tell us that again. We will do what we have to do. The issue is that no one is above our rules.

Schaefer. Dr. Broder, did any officials at the NCI notify the Editor of the *New England Journal of Medicine* that the [fraudulent] St. Luc [hospital in Montreal] data was in doubt?

Broder. No, they did not until very recently. Because it was the mistaken belief that the primary obligation should be with the person who authored the words. I still hold to that principle. The person who authors a paper has the primary duty to retract and correct that paper, irrespective of what a government does. The belief, I believe, was that Dr. Fisher was extremely preeminent, extremely experienced, knew what he was doing. In addition, there was some inhibition and self-consciousness about ordering him to do anything. It becomes difficult and awkward for the NCI to act alone without the investigator cooperating with us.

The Penalty for Faking Data

Schaefer. Dr. [Lyle] Bivens [Director of the Office of Research Integrity, US Department of Health and Human Services], I noticed that Dr. Poisson [of St. Luc, who admitted fabricating cancer-trial data] was prohibited from serving on the Public Health Advisory Committee and was barred from receiving federal funds or grants for a period of eight years. Is this a maximum debarment?

Bivens. The longest one I know of is ten years. The modal term for debarments across the Department is on the order of three years. So anything in excess of three years, we have to make an especially strong case for the debarring official.

Schaefer. I guess the question I have is that if somebody is guilty of fraud, why should they ever be, ever be eligible to receive federal funds?

Bivens. That's a perfectly legitimate question. I think in some cases, they should never be eligible to receive grants. I guess I would be surprised if Dr. Poisson ever came in for an NIH application in the foreseeable future. But, nevertheless, I'm stuck with the practice of the Department and the standard terms of debarment. We have to argue quite strongly for debarments in excess of three years....

Dingell Reads a Drug Firm's Memo

Dingell. Yesterday afternoon, Zeneca Pharmaceuticals [manufacturer of tamoxifen] produced a number of documents to the Subcommittee regarding their knowledge of cancers and deaths associated with the B-14 trial [of tamoxifen, as both a cancer treatment and preventive]. One such document is an internal Zeneca memorandum, dated July 7,

1993, and I'm quoting: "I then proceeded to tell Dr. Fisher that the increasing number of patients within the B-14 trial developing endometrial cancer while on Nolvadex did prompt us to look at this issue more closely. Upon careful review of the data, we felt there was an increased risk to develop endometrial cancer with Nolvadex and that we will modify our label to reflect this incidence...."

"However [Dingell continued reading] I did comment that it did have more of an impact on the European trial, which would require that the protocol and the consent form be modified. Dr. Fisher did comment about the potential negative publicity that could occur. In particular, this could be the bullet being sought by the health industry in the UK to stop the European potential trial. If this is the case, that would have a major effect in the United States. He agreed that we should be prepared for this potential negative outcome."

Now [Dingell still speaking], Dr. Broder, are you aware of this exchange between Zeneca Pharmaceuticals and Dr. Fisher?

Broder. I was not aware. I am quite disturbed by some of the things that you just read.

Dingell. It is a document which I think should concern us. Is it not? It tends to indicate that perhaps maybe the pharmaceutical house and Dr. Fisher have not been sufficiently forthcoming, though, does it not?

Broder. I'm comparatively [sic] concerned that I don't disagree with what you have just said.

Dingell. Now, the University of Pittsburgh solicited a million dollars from Zeneca for the endowment of a chair. They wound up getting \$600,000. This is while the test of the particular pharmaceutical is going on.

Varmus. I personally take some—I have some concern about engaging in that kind of relationship.

Dingell. I wonder. Does it pass the Aunt Minnie Sniff Test?

Varmus. What test? I'm sorry.

Dingell. If Aunt Minnie were to sniff this, what would she say?

Varmus. Can you explain the test to me, sir?

Dingell. Well, Aunt Minnie is somebody we use around here because she has a sensitive nose. What we're trying to figure out is would she like the smell of this or not.

Varmus. Probably not.

Do NCI Rules Also Apply to Gallo?

Rep. Marjorie Margolies-Mezvinsky (D-Pa.). You have removed [Fisher] as a principal investigator, as administrator of the [cancer trials] program. We have been told that he was removed because NCI had some doubt about his continued fitness to serve as principal investigator. Can you describe for the Subcommittee the principle of "fitness" and how you applied it in his case?

Broder. I would use "suitability." But I didn't do a legal

(Continued on Page 5)

... NCI Head Says He Will Review the Gallo Case

(Continued from Page 4)

analysis. But, basically, the bottom line is that what we felt was that Dr. Fisher could not be the individual with whom we corresponded on matters of the performance of this grant, which had to do with things such as specific compliance with our rules, specific implementation of auditing procedures, proper notification of problems. This was not a determination and should not be construed as a determination that Dr. Fisher is not fit to function as a surgeon or as a clinical scientist. That is why I tried in my opening statement to draw a distinction between his formidable intellect and formidable record in spite of all the things that we talked about, his contributions. Dr. Fisher is a Lasker Award winner. He has made a number of contributions.

Varmus. The NCI recommended to the University that Dr. Fisher be replaced as the Director of that project for administrative cause, and I agree with that assessment.

Margolies-Mezvinsky. [To Varmus] How do you view this standard of, whatever you want to call it, fitness, suitability, and how do you believe it should be applied in other cases?

Varmus. This is a case-by-case analysis. It's an unusual circumstance, but we had a very significant problem on our hands, namely: that the precipitating feature here was the failure of the NSABP to publicly distribute the results of the Office of Research Integrity investigation and the reanalysis of the NSABP study. Under those circumstances, it was proper that the NCI evaluate administrative practices at the NSABP and what they found were a number of failures, of administrative oversight that, to my mind, called for Dr. Fisher's replacement.

Margolies-Mezvinsky. We are talking about the application of a principle, correct?

Varmus. Yes.

Margolies-Mezvinsky. Are we applying the application of this principle consistently?

Varmus. We are. But we don't have very many cases to apply it to at this point.

Margolies-Mezvinsky. Dr. Broder, does the principle of fitness or suitability also apply to NCI intramural scientists?

Broder. It most certainly does.

Margolies-Mezvinsky. What about Dr. Gallo [NCI lab chief, deemed guilty of misconduct in AIDS research by the Office of Research Integrity, but officially exonerated when ORI declined to oppose Gallo's appeal of the finding.]

Broder. Is there a specific question about Dr. Gallo or do you wish me just to make a general answer?

Margolies-Mezvinsky. Is it still under consideration, or are you applying that principle?

Broder. Dr. Varmus and I have discussed a number of issues related to Dr. Gallo. The issues involving Dr. Gallo have until recently been complicated by a formal inquiry process that has gone from OSI [Office of Scientific Integrity] to ORI [the successor organization]. We were awaiting the

results of that process to end and also to have the kind of fact finding that we needed in order to make a decision. In Dr. Fisher's case, we believed that there were sufficient and compelling facts at our disposal. But we will review the situation and the facts of Dr. Gallo's case. Staff members [on Dingell's Subcommittee] have been very kind in providing information to me and I believe will be meeting with me again, if I'm alive at the end of these hearings.

Margolies-Mezvinsky. Dr. Broder, isn't it true that NCI has always possessed the authority and the ability to apply these standards and to take the actions that you have taken in this case?

Broder. Yes.

Margolies-Mezvinsky. Have these standards and actions previously been routinely applied or are we seeing something new?

Broder. I am not aware of the NCI asserting its rights under the *Code of Federal Regulations* and other applicable statutes to demand data from an investigator, disseminate that data, publish the data without the investigator's necessary involvement, even possibly against the will of the investigator. It has a downside, however, in that it could create situations in which we at NCI are making statements which are at variance from a formidable intellect and leader in a field, and that also has its downsides. That's why our hope had been—this is an explanation, not an excuse—our hope had been that we could reach a situation where Dr. Fisher, with our assistance, would take the lead to come forward with all the different issues.

Margolies-Mezvinsky. Dr. Varmus, do you support NCI's willingness to exercise this existing authority, and will we see similar actions, if necessary, across the board at NIH?

Varmus. I support it in this case and, by implication, I would support it in other situations that are comparable.

An "Excessive Level of Collegiality"

Rep. Sherrod Brown (D-Ohio). We have the Director of NCI telling subordinates to have the University of Pittsburgh reanalyze the data, republish the analysis, not publish further studies using this falsified, fabricated data. Yet, every single directive was disobeyed, ignored, taken too lightly, whatever. Why? What happened?

Broder. I believe it is, in part, a function of Dr. Fisher's formidable reputation, and I believe that the staff were attempting to negotiate a collegial, non-confrontation way of dealing with a pioneering figure who obviously knew a great deal. I believe there was an excessive level of collegiality and a higher level of tolerance than is now the case. Staff simply did not wish to confront and order Dr. Fisher, who, after all, is the person that had made many contributions, had a great deal of status in the scientific community. The other issue is that the staff felt that Dr. Fisher had been right on a number of occasions, that, in fact, there were no changes that would

(Continued on Page 6)

Stanford Approves Strict Conflict-of-Interest Code

The Stanford University Faculty Senate has endorsed a new conflict-of-interest code that can leave only the uninitiated wondering about what's been going on in idyllic Palo Alto that necessitates explicit rules of proper behavior. According to a university press release, the requirements of the code include the following:

- "Faculty must maintain a significant presence on campus when on duty.
- "Faculty must not have significant outside professional or managerial responsibilities that detract from their primary allegiance to Stanford.
- "Faculty must promote the open and timely exchange of scholarly results, and inform students and colleagues about outside obligations that might influence the free exchange of scholarly information between them and the faculty member.
- "Faculty may use university resources only to further the missions of the university.
- "Faculty must disclose the creation of all patentable inventions in the course of their university activities. Ownership will be assigned to the university, regardless of source of funding, and the inventor will share in royalties. The university will not claim ownership to copyrightable scholarly materials such as books, musical and artistic works. Unless created under sponsored projects, the creator may also retain title to software that is copyrighted.

• "Faculty must disclose consulting arrangements or significant financial interests in an outside entity before the university will approve arrangements with that entity relating to gifts, sponsored projects, technology licensing and procurements."

Under development for 18 months, the conflict-of-interest code was adopted by a vote of 26-2, in an atmosphere the Stanford announcement described as "contentious at times."

Breast Cancer

(Continued from Page 5)

come from this and that other studies were confirming the value of breast-sparing surgery. I do believe that had there been a public health hazard, that the other steps would have been taken, but that's of no consolation to the Committee, and I accept your point.

Brown. The Subcommittee staff has found that as early as July of 1992 that NCI officials were admonishing Dr. Fisher, admonishing his colleagues, to upgrade and strengthen the auditing procedures. What was the response of Dr. Fisher to those repeated requests from NCI?

Broder. I would say that Dr. Fisher's response to us was quite disrespectful of the role that government employees play and quite disrespectful of the status and functions that we have, and—I think I'm accurately paraphrasing—basically said words to the effect of who are you to criticize me. I know how to do clinical trials. I've been doing them before you were a doctor.

Job Changes & Appointments

The White House has finally got around to announcing its long-known choice for Deputy Director at the National Science Foundation, **Anne C. Petersen**, Vice President for Research, Dean of the Graduate School, and Professor of Adolescent Development and Pediatrics at the University of Minnesota. But the announcement, on April 12, merely stated an intention to nominate. Still to come is the official nomination, rarely a hurry-up matter for lesser posts in the Clinton Administration. When formally nominated and confirmed by the Senate, Petersen will succeed **Frederick M. Bernthal**, a 1990 Bush appointee, who has not said where he's going. Petersen, a PhD from the University of Chicago, formerly was Dean of the College of Health and Human Development at Penn State. She will be the first woman to hold the Deputy post, No. 2 in NSF hierarchy.

Janet G. Osteryoung, head of the Chemistry Department at North Carolina State University, has been appointed Director of the NSF Chemistry Division, which disburses about \$120 million a year for research and education.

John I. Gallin has been appointed Director of the Clinical Center and Associate Director for Clinical Research at the National Institutes of Health. Since 1991, Gallin has been Chief of the Laboratory of Host Defenses in the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, and previously served as Director of the Institute's Division of Intramural Research. NIH Director Harold Varmus made the appointment, which fills one of the most important, difficult and long-vacant jobs on the NIH campus.

John Y. Killen Jr. has moved up from Acting Director to Director of the Division of AIDS at the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, the lead institute for AIDS research at NIH.

John D. Holmfeld, a staff alumnus of the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee and other science-related posts in Washington, has been appointed Senior Advisor for Science Policy in the Washington office of The Dana Alliance for Brain Initiatives, an association of leading brain researchers sponsored by the Charles A. Dana Foundation.

NSF Awards for 2-Year Schools

With six planning awards of about \$50,000 each, the National Science Foundation has launched a program aimed at upgrading technical education in two-year colleges. Cited by Clinton policymakers as the neglected training ground for much of the workforce, the two-year institutions are the object of NSF's new Advanced Technological Education Program. The awards are for planning by consortia headed by Austin (Texas) Community College; CUNY NY City Technical College; Chemeketa Community College, Salem, Ore.; Middlesex County College, Edison, NJ; Montgomery College, Rockville, Md., and Southeast Community College, Lincoln, Nebraska.

In Print

(Continued from Page 8)

Environmental Health Perspectives (Order Processing Code 5501; monthly, \$36 per year; \$45 for foreign orders), in an expanded, slick format this year, the journal of the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences, a part of the National Institutes of Health. Each issue (about 90 pp.) contains original, peer-reviewed research articles, book reviews, news about the institute, legislation, and various other environmental matters, meeting reports, commentaries, etc.

Order from: Superintendent of Documents, USGPO, PO Box 371954, Pittsburgh, Pa. 1520-794; tel. 202/783-3238; fax 202/512-2223.

NIDA Notes (24 pp., no charge), bimonthly newsletter of the National Institute on Drug Abuse, another wing of NIH, reports on NIDA programs, staff changes, meetings, publications, etc.

Order from: NIDA Notes Subscription Department, R.O.W. Sciences, Inc., Suite 400, 1700 Research Blvd., Rockville, Md. 20850-3142; fax 301/294-5401.

Cold Fusion (monthly, \$98 a year in US; \$122 for foreign orders), a smart-looking, colorful magazine, straight-faced and serious, despite the near-universal dismissal of cold fusion as fantasy akin to perpetual motion. The first issue (May, 96 pp.) is chock full of cheerful news and reports about cold-fusion research, depicted as rapidly progressing, especially in Japan. A prefatory note says the editor, Eugene L. Mallove, "holds a Doctoral Degree (Sc.D.) in Environmental Health Sciences (Air Pollution Control Engineering) from Harvard University." Listed as members of the editorial advisory board are Nobelist Julian Schwinger and Hideo Ikegami, of Japan's National Institute for Fusion Science. Included is a letter from President Bill Clinton to Editor Mallove, which says:

"Dear Eugene:

"Thank you for your letter regarding cold fusion. I have referred your letter to my Office of Science and Technology Policy for appropriate review. I value your ideas and appreciate your taking the time to write. As we work to meet the challenges that lie ahead, I hope I can count on your support.

"Sincerely,

"Bill Clinton."

Order from: **Cold Fusion Magazine**, 70 Route 202 North, Peterborough, New Hampshire 03458; tel. 1-800/234-8458; fax 603/924-8613.

Human Genome News (bimonthly, 12 pp., no charge), newsletter jointly sponsored by the two big sponsors of genome research, the National Institutes of Health and the Department of Energy, with news of research, awards, application deadlines, publications, meetings, etc.

Order from: Human Genome Management Information System, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, PO Box 2008, Oak Ridge, Tenn. 37831-6050; tel. 615/576-6669; fax 615/574-9888.

To the Editor: Fraud, Crooks & Jerks

The "distinction between jerks and crooks," emphasized by NIH Director Harold Varmus (SGR, February 15: "Varmus on Crooks vs. Jerks"), goes to the heart of the proper handling of an allegation of misconduct. Judgments should be made on the facts, not the personalities.

The crook/jerk distinction was first made by someone with a good deal of experience with allegations of misconduct, Tina Gunsalus, JD, Associate Vice Chancellor for Research at the University of Illinois, during a talk to the American Association for the Advancement of Science on February 10, 1992.

This picturesque and useful phrase was immediately adopted by Howard K. Schachman, PhD, a former President of the Federation of American Societies for Experimental Biology, in his lecture on April 6, 1992, at the FASEB meetings in Anaheim (FASEB Newsletter April/May 1992).

Harold Varmus, noting that Howard Schachman was "very fond of making the distinction," presumably absorbed the phrase from his fellow molecular biologist when he appointed Schachman his roving ombudsman [reporting to Varmus at NIH].

A young phrase, but what a provenance!

Drummond Rennie, MD

Adjunct Professor of Medicine,
UC, San Francisco; Deputy Editor
(West), JAMA

To Order or Renew

Science & Government Report
Northwest Station, Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015

☐ Renew my subscription ☐ Enter my subscription

Institutional subscribers: one year, \$425.00 ☐
two years, \$730.00 ☐

Non-USA airmail, \$35.00 per year; non-USA surface
mail, \$15.00 per year additional

☐ Check enclosed ☐ Please Bill

Please charge to: ☐ MasterCard ☐ VISA

Account# _____ Exp. date _____

Signature _____

Name _____

Address _____

Zip _____

Toll-Free Subscription Service: 1-800-522-1970
In Wash., D.C.: 785-5054 / FAX: (202) 362-2790

In Print

Official reports and other publications of special interest to the research community

(Copies of publications listed here are available from the indicated sources—not from SGR)

Fueling a Competitive Economy: Strategic Plan (37 pp., no charge), from the Department of Energy, an assemblage of managerial banalities and platitudes presented as DOE's "long-range strategy" into the next century. Among other goodnesses, DOE aims to "Promote flexibility in the energy sector," "Encourage flexibility in research programs," and "Live up to our core values and vision ('walk our talk')." The plan states, "Our culture will help us achieve our vision to fuel a competitive economy." There's a good deal of vague prose on DOE labs assisting industry and promoting science, but little of substance about the future of nuclear power, DOE staffing under shrinking federal budgets, or most other matters that merit strategic concern. However, credit DOE management with political aptitude in producing this exercise in high-vacuum prose. "Strategic planning," which is supposed to signify foresight rather than drift, is increasingly popular as federal agencies scramble for money. But when performed rigorously, it produces losers, who convert into adversaries. Better, then, to strive for inoffensive generalities, as DOE does with aplomb (e.g., "Ensure a highly motivated workforce.") Doubters should look back to the 18 months of tribal scientific strife that beset the Bernadine Healy regime in 1991-92 at NIH when she attempted to draft a serious strategic plan.

Order from: Department of Energy, 1000 Independence Ave. SW, PA-5, Washington, DC 20585; tel. 202/586-5575.

Energy Use and Carbon Emissions: Some International Comparisons (DOE/EIA-0579; 61 pp.; free from DOE until available "soon" through the US Government Printing Office, price not yet set), focuses mainly on the big countries in the 24-member Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, the so-called Group of Seven (the US, Japan, Germany, UK, France, Canada, Italy). The report contains lots of data about trends in industrial energy use, home heating, transportation, etc. Among the major points: Nuclear was the fastest growing of all non-fossil fuels, with consumption between 1970-90 rising 2000 percent; commercial power generated by geothermal, solar, wind, and other non-hydroelectric renewables increased four-fold in that period; increased use of nuclear energy and natural gas have resulted in lower carbon emissions per unit of economic growth. The report was requested by Rep. Philip Sharp (D-Ind.), Chairman of the House Subcommittee on Energy and Power.

Order from: National Energy Information Center, EI-231, Energy Information Administration, Forrestal Building, Room 1F-048, Washington, DC 20585; tel. 202/586-8800; fax 202/586-0727.

Air Pollution: EPA's Progress in Determining the Costs and Benefits of Clear Air Legislation (GAO/RCED-94-20; 39 pp., no charge), by the General Accounting Office (GAO), which reports that the Environmental Protection Agency is moving ahead, though slowly, in fulfilling a 1990 Congressional directive to conduct cost-benefit analyses of past and newly adopted amendments to the Clean Air Act. EPA's first report, looking back on the effects of legislation, was due by November 15, 1991. However, the arrival has been repeatedly delayed, and is now set for this year. The GAO report attributes the torpid pace to the daunting nature of the assignment, noting that "isolating the effects of federal clean air legislation—some of which the Congress enacted over 20 years ago—is a difficult analytical task." The study of future effects, due by November 15, 1992, is also running late. "As of December 1993," the GAO found, "EPA had begun to develop a methodology for the prospective study but had not yet begun any analyses." The two studies, the GAO states, will cost EPA \$3.2 million for contract work and 24 staff years of its own employees.

Order from: USGAO, PO Box 6015, Gaithersburg, Md. 20884-6015; tel. 202/512-6000; fax 301/258-4066.

Science, Technology, and Innovation Policies: Federation of Russia (116 pp., \$16), Volume I of a report on science and technology in post-Soviet Russia, prepared by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development Center for the Economies in Transition. An OECD announcement (SGR has not yet received a copy of the report) refers to Russia's S&T inheritance as "deteriorating rapidly," and says the publication addresses such questions as, "What is the status of research and development today? What is becoming of researchers and engineers? How is the conversion from military to civilian production progressing?" The announcement says that the second volume, to be published later this year, "contains a detailed report of the organization and current directions in the scientific and technological system and important statistical data."

Order from: OECD Publications and Information, 2001 L St. NW, Washington, DC 20036-4910; tel. 202/785-6323; fax 202/785-0350; also available from OECD offices, booksellers, and subscription agencies in many major cities around the world.

Nucleus, quarterly magazine of the Union of Concerned Scientists (Spring issue 14 pp.; subscriptions for "any reasonable" contribution), on the occasion of the UCS's 25th anniversary, a review of its work in nuclear safety, arms control, energy policy, biotechnology, and other scientific and technical topics on the agenda of one of the foremost organizations of researchers concerned with social and political issues. Included is a list of publications and visual materials produced by UCS, which reports "75,000 contributing Sponsors."

Order from: Union of Concerned Scientists, Publications, Department N, 26 Church St., Cambridge, Mass. 02238; tel. 617/547-5552; fax 617/864-9405.

(Continued on Page 7)

